THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke*

No. 4 JULY 1961 New Series Vol. IV

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Northern Half-Lights

While the Upper House of York Convocation approved of the proposals for full communion with the projected united Church of Lanka, only the Bishop of Ripon voting against or abstaining, the Lower House recognized, by 40 votes to 32, that the Church as projected would be a true part of the Church Universal and possessed of the apostolic ministry of bishops, priests and deacons, but then refused, by 40 votes to 37, to take the consequential step of full communion with that Church. On receipt next day of this Gilbertian intelligence from York, the Lower House of Canterbury adjourned its own debate until October, the Upper House having already approved of the proposals unanimously. The Lower House was not uninfluenced by a hankering on the part of some to baptize its own new Standing Order under which the vote on a proposition of this kind may be postponed, subject to the President, until the next group of sessions.

This Standing Order was made after the debate on the Church of South India, which those who opposed that scheme felt to have been rushed. On this present debate, the Lower House of York, by 40 votes to 37, supported a motion by the Bishop of Ripon recommending limited intercommunion with the Church of Lanka on the lines of South India.

Actuarial Grace

The Church at large should arouse itself to the crucial character of the steep pass we have now reached on the tortuous road to reunion from the base camp of Lambeth 1920. The South India scheme was an exhausted lurch downhill. It rejected full communion with Free Churchmen, who had brought themselves to accept episcopacy after centuries of protest, unless they would also accept new ordination by a bishop and

so bring into question the validity and fruits of their own Orders. This vengeful retrospective requirement of men who had sacrificed their own essentials in the name of Christian brotherhood was the most un-English thing the Church of England has ever done. Full communion will be generously conceded to South India when these same Free Churchmen have all died out, and the date ahead has been nicely calculated. South India was the first known instance of salvation by actuarial grace.

Jonah Swallowed the Whale

Even so, a minority amongst us opposed the South India scheme as a dilution of Anglican Orders. In part to meet their view, the Protestant denominations in Ceylon, as in North India, have prepared, in closest consultation with theologians in England, proposals based on the unification of ministries by episcopal ordination at the inauguration of the reunited Church. The Lambeth Conference blessed the proposals. Episcopally ordained and Free Church ministers alike, neither denying a tittle of their respective Orders, and implicitly confessing the grievous fragmentation on earth of the Church Universal, would together accept episcopal ordination into a new Church on earth welded of the fragments. But though episcopacy is thus asserted with a stridency that Hooker would have deprecated, yet accepted by the Free Churches, it is now objected amongst us that a minister episcopally ordained into our fragment of the Church Universal cannot and must not share in a new episcopal ordination into a new Church uniting the fragments. This is to speak as the wolf to the lamb. It is sheerly to assert that our episcopal fragment of the Church is the true Church and the non-episcopal fragments false. The Bishop of Ripon fears that the Anglican communion is set 'on a course which must end eventually in its disappearance'. Obviously our communion must disappear in its present form, to be reborn, if it is ever to unite with other communions on the Lambeth basis of spiritual parity. We are not to look for a fourth note, but a star. The Bishop's only road ahead would be that of boa-constrictor absorption by our Church of all the Free Churches. More accurately, on a world view of the strength of the Protestant denominations, the Anglican sailorman James is to consume the crew.

Mist On High Ground

A just and charitable resolution of the Lanka disharmony has not been helped by the uncertain note sounded by the new leading trumpet. Speaking after the vote at York, Dr. Ramsey said that the Lambeth Conference was right about the Ceylon scheme, but wrong about the North India plan. Yet the differences between these are secondary; they have been prepared together over 20 years and are presented in one volume with a common and brilliant introduction by Bishop Bayne. As seriously, a

positive answer has been hindered by the exercise in logic-chopping performed by Bishop Newbigin of South India. He has desiccated the proposal for new ordination of episcopal and non-episcopal ministers into an arid dilemma. *The Times*, which for decades has never thundered but only muttered on Church affairs, followed him into this cerebral wasteland:

> The essential point of the critics is that no Anglican clergyman can rightly admit even the possibility that his orders are invalid by exposing himself to anything which resembles, however slightly, a new act of ordination.

Dr. Fisher, in his last innings as President of the Canterbury Convocation, and with enviable control, his main life work in jeopardy at the latest hour, wrist-turned this yorker through the slips with an elegant and characteristic stroke. He deeply thanked *The Times* for this sentence 'which really does help everyone' and added that also

> 'the essential point of the advocate is that no non-episcopal minister can rightly admit even the possibility that his orders are invalid by exposing himself to anything which resembles, however slightly, a new act of ordination. In this matter the non-episcopal ministers had expressed themselves ready to expose themselves precisely to that risk.'

Five-To-Twelve

Anglican clergy now seriously risk destroying our Church as we know it, because the laity are awakened to their interminable vacillations in this paramount matter of reunion. *The Birmingham Post*, in praising Dr. Fisher for his leadership, pleaded,

> St. John wrote: 'We know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren'. In all the major Christian communions inadequate attention has been paid to that very definite statement. Those who, in all the branches of the Church Universal, seek to bring this statement fully into the consciousness of Christians bring nearer the day when the Church will fulfil its function in the world more nearly as it ought.

The *Sunday Times* took a wider but no less imperative view.

> Standing thus between the Roman Catholics and those Protestant sects which reject the idea of one Church as a threat to the freedom of man to worship God in his own way, and being at the same time in communion with Orthodox and other eastern Churches and also related by history and liturgy to Wesleyans and other Nonconformists, the Church of England has a special opportunity and a special duty in respect of Christian reunion. And never did a duty seem more plain and urgent. Throughout the world Christianity is on the defence: challenged by Communism and other god-spurning faiths, eroded by

materialism and indifference, sharing the odium of imperialism in much of its missionary endeavour which is entering upon a new age of martyrdom, the Church is enfeebled both among its adherents and in face of its foes by its own rivalries and divisions. The hour is ripe for a great effort towards unity. . . .

Let the bigots skulk in their sectarian caves: the time has come to do open battle against the evil of disunity, that unfailing ally of the enemies of Christianity itself.

The death-wish has proved more fatal to classes and institutions than any hostile force. They grow too tired to adapt themselves yet again to serve their society.

PER CAUTIONEM AD ASTRA

The Bishop of Manchester, reflecting the sobersidedness of Lancashire but not on this occasion its curiously Gallic *élan*, surely over-charged his anti-missile missile in deploring popular excitement over rocket flights.

To see the great nations boasting their achievements against one another, like small boys bragging about the speed of their fathers' cars, seems to me plain silly. But it is worse than silly when vast sums are spent on this enterprise, sums that had much better be used on feeding the hungry and healing the sick.

No one would wish to bar space research, but it should be co-operative, not nationalistic.

The man who has made two blades of grass grow where one grew before, the man who, by his imagination and service, turns one of our young delinquents into a useful citizen, has done more than Major Gagarin.

Had man listened too earnestly to this argument from the needs of the sinful and poor, which latter we were once rather impatiently reminded would be always with us, he, to be Irish, would never have become a man. Were Bentham his favourite prophet, or the humanitarian all or nearly all, Everest would not have been climbed, the cathedrals built, modern science born, nor the Gospels written. The oddest fact about him is that he does not live by bread alone; man will land on the moon because it is there.

'GOOD-BYE DOLLY GRAY'[1]

Perhaps no constitutional change in recent history has been accompanied by such deep foreboding as that by which South Africa became a Republic and left the Commonwealth. Even a representative Republican speaker on the B.B.C., Mr. S. A. Cilliers, considered that so drastic a change on the strength of a 4% majority in an electorate representing only one-fifth of the population was 'unconventional'. Others have been

[1] The title of R. Krueger's excellent work on the Boer War, published this year.

more forthright. From South Africa have come reports of the deep rift now separating the two branches of the White population, and of the banding together of all non-Whites in an opposition whose effectiveness may grow with time. Economists, who have had more favourable facts to work on, have tempered their optimism with fears of declining capital reserves and hence unemployment, so long as the 'granite' policy of Dr. Verwoerd continues to prevail.

Three things strike the outside observer. First, the intense interest with which South Africa's affairs are being watched in this country. It is useless for the Nationalists to blame the 'English Press' for unfavourable reactions. With a true instinct for self-preservation, the British public has felt that Dr. Verwoerd's policies ultimately concern them. They are calculated to damage permanently relations between Whites and non-Whites everywhere, and thus to jeopardise the Western world as a whole. In a world where two-thirds of the population is non-White and no part of it is more than a few hours distant from any other, we are all involved. There can be no contracting out.

Secondly, and following from this, it is well to remember that these events are not just another round in a perennial Boer-British struggle. It is as futile to re-fight Spion Kop and Paardeberg, as it is for Southerners to seek to recapture the days of Gettysburg and Cold Harbor (though the perpetually Pyrrhic nature of Boer victories is worth bearing in mind). Had the problem concerned even mainly the two White races, Republic within the Commonwealth would have satisfied the great majority of those concerned. But every member of the Commonwealth is involved in the situation in South Africa. Some have direct interests like ourselves, India, and the African Commonwealth countries, others indirect, through the repercussions of South African racial policy on their own population problems, like Australia and even Canada. But it all adds up to the fact that non-involvement in her destiny is impossible.

The third impression, however, makes any speedy improvement unlikely. Barring accidents—and anything can happen in the present situation—Dr. Verwoerd's position is a strong one, despite all that has been said. The Swellendam bye-election which resulted in an increased Nationalist majority has put paid to an early coalition between moderate Nationalists and the Opposition. Moreover, it is difficult to see how a country with an active trade balance and the world's richest gold-mines can go bankrupt. The relative failure of the non-White 3-day strike shows that this opposition is still incoherent, and its organisations, like Robert Owen's Grand National Consolidated Trades Union, high-sounding, heterogeneous, ramshackle and ineffective. The Congo is no advertisement for non-White domination in the future.

Even so, it will be difficult for South Africa to subsist in isolation, isolation in every sphere of life, political, economic, moral, ecclesiastical.

Where men of the calibre of Smuts, Botha and even Herzog, failed in their efforts to unite the two white races, the Verwoerd dictatorship is unlikely to succeed. Indeed, the hegemony of one part of one race over all the rest seems unlikely on any showing to prove permanently workable. The *Standestaat* became extinct in Europe with the fall of Austria-Hungary in 1918. It can hardly solve the problem of southern Africa in 1961. Eventually, a federal constitution, with checks and balances expressing the different and contrasting interests in the territory, and associated with other Commonwealth countries, will have to be worked out. In this, not all the work of the Nationalists need be thrown over. A federal Republic (with perhaps a special arrangement for Natal) and at least two further temporary African protectorates in Transkei and northern Transvaal respectively seem reasonable foundations. But time is only neutral. The Commonwealth, and for its part, the Oecumenical Movement, have yet to show themselves so viable and thriving that their loss is truly felt. It is the positive achievement that counts—not protests against *apartheid* by comfortable intellectuals in London. Only if we give an example of successful handling of our own problems can we expect South Africans to be prepared once more to follow our lead.

NORMAN SYKES

By E. F. Carpenter, Canon of Westminster

Nothing is more difficult than to capture in words the unique flavour of a highly individualized person. This is abundantly true of Norman Sykes who died, while still in the full flood of his powers, at the comparatively early age of 63 on 20 March 1961. It might well be said of him (as was said of Erasmus) *'est homo per se'*. Certainly those who had both the privilege and delight of knowing him will mourn the passing of a friend as they at the same time deplore the loss of a distinguished ecclesiastical historian. Indeed though his historical writing was always restrained, and he seldom allowed himself to obtrude in it, it was yet the 'virtue' of the man which added up to such competency and expertise in his chosen field of eighteenth century studies.

In the best and most positive sense of the word, Norman Sykes was a liberal-minded person, his supreme interest being in people rather than in ideas (a good priority)—a predilection which made him sensitive to the particularity and idiosyncrasies of his fellow human beings. His conversation, usually spiced with the most racy anecdotes, was shrewdly and entertainingly personal; as well as being, on occasions, so disarmingly frank as to require the cautionary prefix: 'in strictest confidence'. Along with a perennial curiosity as to people, both in their individual and corporate expressions, there went a real sympathy and compassion which his essential shyness never entirely concealed. It was from such depths of character that the historian sprang: as did also that distrust of the too philosophic and ideological which (so he thought) tended to impose a rigid conditioning structure on the flux of events. History to Norman Sykes had all the untidiness, sometimes the mis-shapenness of particular things: it did not admit of too precise a systematization, any more than does life itself. The historian must observe, sit down patiently before the facts, be strenuous in the pursuit of them, and be respectful to their implications. Yet this does not rule out interpretation, and Norman Sykes took over his schemat, almost unconsciously, and it therefore never became obtrusive, from the presuppositions of Christian Faith—a Faith born out of a value-response to history.

I always myself felt that it was this willingness to learn from the discipline of established facts and his deep sympathy for people, which encouraged him to turn his attention early to the eighteenth century church. In this field his substantial contribution was made in his three books, widely spaced throughout his career, *Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London* (1926), *Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century* (1934) and *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury* (1957). There was a great deal to be learnt, he felt, about the Hanoverian Church in spite of the fact that it had usually been regarded as the Cinderella of English

Church history. Even Abbey and Overton, who had spent much time on it, lacked the historical perspective and the essential sympathy with eighteenth-century man to see the period other than through the eyes of the leaders of the Oxford Movement. It was typical that Norman Sykes began and sustained his studies throughout life with a mammoth reading of previously untouched sources—letters, diaries, visitational returns, act books, state papers, etc. Such enormous labour, coupled with a rare affinity of spirit, enabled him to become uniquely sensitive to a century which produced Hoadley—who, he discovered, actually did *once* visit his Welsh diocese of Bangor—Law, Butler, Wesley—and Parson Woodforde. This meant that he became aware of the achievements as well as the more obvious failures of the eighteenth-century Church. It would indeed be difficult in any age to find two more highly principled and diligent men than Bishop Gibson and Archbishop Wake, both of whom their biographer greatly admired, though these churchmen shared many of the current ideas of their age which subsequent generations have deplored. In William Watson, who neglected his diocese for agricultural pursuits on the shores of Lake Windermere, the eighteenth century became almost a caricature of itself—especially in its attitude to office. Yet it was only by diligent research and by getting to know the facts that Norman Sykes was able to give this 'new look' to the Hanoverian Church.

This revival of interest in a somewhat despised chapter of English Church history, brought about by patient enquiry, constitutes in itself a liberal education, for which the Modern Churchmen's Union, of which he was a dedicated member, owes him a great debt of gratitude. A willingness to follow where the argument seems to lead and to be responsibly critical of long established opinions in the light of a fuller knowledge—these are central to the modernist attitude. The critical apparatus which Norman Sykes brought to bear on the *Ecclesia Anglicana* of two centuries ago needs equally to be applied to the Church of our own day. Indeed he himself recognised that what his investigations had taught him in respect of the Church of England in the past was relevant to many contemporary issues, particularly to those which have a long history behind them. Once again he saw life as wider than logic, and he therefore regarded the comprehensiveness of the established Church, arising as it did out of a specific historical situation, as having proved itself to be intrinsically valuable. Thus in his shorter works, equally impressive as they are in their scholarship, in particular in *Old Priest and New Presbyter* (1956), he was able to show, beyond argument (*pace* Gregory Dix), that within the Church of England other views as to the nature or *esse* of episcopacy had been current than the more 'high' view dominant since the Oxford Movement. It is significant that here Norman Sykes preferred the historical to the theological

approach, which is also true of his *The Crisis of the Reformation* (1935), *The English Religious Tradition* (1953), and *Man as Churchman* (1961).

Nor was his impact on contemporary religious life confined to the written word. The solid store of his unrivalled factual knowledge of a many-sided tradition (that of Professor Claude Jenkins was less under control!) gave significance and distinction to his speeches (all too rare) in both Assembly and Convocation; and enabled him always to hold the attention of his audience—even in the afternoon. Such speeches showed that there was nothing of the detached recluse or remote scholar about Norman Sykes: nor did he see the Church of England as essentially a museum-piece to be investigated with clinical efficiency. His interest in eighteenth-century bishops was sharpened by the fact that the species had survived into the twentieth century. How interested he always was in their recruitment, who was to go where, etc.; and how lugubrious he affected to be that too few contemporary prelates had the scholarship of a Butler, or even the immense if ill-digested learning of a Warburton. It was all very kindly, but there was a vein of intense seriousness behind it. Norman Sykes believed passionately that the right kind of scholarship gave a certain maturity to a man's judgement and so far from removing him from practical life introduced him into it more firmly. I remember how indignant he was with an eminent ecclesiastic who suggested that as a scholar he (Norman) might not be at home in the administration of a Cathedral. His all too brief tenure of the Deanery of Winchester shows how uninformed and superficial such criticism was!

I have already suggested, by implication, that historians by and large are often suspicious of philosophy and impatient of nice theological distinctions. In this respect Norman Sykes was eminently representative of his kind, and it was this temperamental fact which made him warm to the general ethos of the Church of England as he understood it—a Church which was brought to birth in the womb of a complex history and not, as was the case in some of the reformed Churches of Europe, around a regulative and single theological idea. In this respect Norman Sykes was typically English, sharing to the full that pragmatic spirit which is reluctant to over-define or to follow a formal logic too far. In particular he was opposed to any minimising attitude towards the established Church which might end with the jettisoning of some of its diverse traditions.

The same basic approach made him suspicious of those who would undermine the historical basis of Christianity itself and by so doing convert it into a kind of gnosis or philosophic form of enlightenment. His common sense, and his boisterous north-country temperament made him more at home when he was getting to grips with *facts*, since in facts there was something to get to grips with, whereas ideas in themselves could be all too insubstantial. It was to be expected, therefore, that he

would not be enthusiastic over Bultmann. If such a limitation occasionally took something of depth and insight from Norman Sykes' work it yet added solidarity and an essential sanity.

It lies outside the scope of this short notice to draw attention to Norman Syke's accessibility; to the untiring concern which he felt for innumerable students, and the prodigal expenditure of time and effort which he gave to them—and this in spite of the constant business of a life which led him from King's College, London, to professorships at Exeter, Westfield, and finally at Cambridge. I myself have every reason to remember this kindness with lasting gratitude. Those who sat at his feet in the lecture room will not soon forget his inimitable style: the spectacles and handkerchief: the rich Northern accent which he resolutely refused to shed: the innumerable sallies—and the conscientious way in which he covered the ground, shedding new insight as he went. His style was intensely personal to himself. I remember being told by a B.B.C. official in charge of talks that when Norman Sykes first broadcasted for him he determined to 'produce' him and to this end suggested certain changes in inflection. But he soon gave up the attempt in despair, and finally realised that any change to suit the medium would be an impoverishment, since all was in character and 'added up'. I believe I am right in saying that Norman Sykes gave one of the longest series ever attempted on the B.B.C.'s Overseas Service.

It is on a more personal note that I would end. Everything about Norman Sykes contributed to the making of a character who was lovable, entertaining, frank, indiscreet (at times)—and highly sensitive. I recall the first occasion that I heard him preach in Westminster Abbey. He was deeply moved by the historical associations (to quote Macaulay) of this 'temple of silence and reconciliation where the enmities of a thousand years lie buried'. He began with a survey of the mounting career of the first Duke of Marlborough, and brought him to the point where, after an enormous expenditure of time, men and money, and after untold disappointments, he seemed on the verge of a complete triumph over an exhausted adversary. Then suddenly, through political intrigue at home, the Duke was unexpectedly recalled to England by Queen Anne. It was a perfect introduction to a profound discourse on the inscrutable Providence of God—the more powerful because it was placed within the dramatic context of the life of a great man. The fact is that the final inspiration of Norman Sykes' researches was a deep and reverent conviction that Providence *was* at work in the affairs of men. I doubt very much whether he would have wished to argue at length with H. A. L. Fisher, who confessed that he could discover no observable patterns in history—for he might have thought that at this level no resolution of the problem involved was possible. But he did give it as his opinion in quoting St. Augustine in his inaugural lecture on being appointed to the

Dixie Professorship at Cambridge (in which Chair he was a distinguished successor to Mandell Creighton and Gwatkin) that they only interpret history aright who *'se patriam inquirere'*—who are themselves seeking a Fatherland.

RECENT STUDIES OF THE REFORMATION

By K. L. Wood Legh

During recent years, our knowledge of Tudor England has been extended mainly in the fields of political and constitutional history; now, to redress the balance, three outstanding works dealing with different aspects of ecclesiastical history have appeared.

In the final volume of his great study of *The Religious Orders in England*[1] Professor Knowles has given by far the most authoritative account we have yet had both of the state of the Religious in the half-century preceding the Reformation and of their suppression. His work is not, indeed, that of a detached observer; his devotion to the monastic ideal and to the teaching of the Church of Rome is evident in many places. But precisely because of this devotion he sees clearly the shortcomings of the Religious in the Tudor Age, and he is as scrupulous in correcting the errors and exaggerations of the monks' apologists, as in pointing out those of their detractors.

Professor Knowles argues convincingly that on the eve of the dissolution the great majority of monasteries were in an economically sound position, neither burdened with corrodies nor crippled with debt. He shows also that the vast majority of monks and canons, nuns and friars were leading eminently respectable and often useful lives, the monks in particular contributing not a little to learning and such arts as music and architecture. This is not to say that episcopal and other visitors were satisfied with what they found. The records of their visitations reveal in individual persons and communities the same faults and vices that their predecessors during the past two centuries and more had been vainly seeking to suppress, but such evils had not greatly increased. If many of the smallest houses—those with not more than ten or twelve inmates—had so decayed that dissolution would seem the only remedy, there were great houses in which the choir services and other monastic duties were performed with exemplary regularity, and between these extremes there was the vast majority of communities which neither achieved nor aspired to more than an easy-going mediocrity.

This mediocrity was a symptom of the worldliness with which almost all were tainted: the Religious shared the interests and occupations of their secular neighbours, and too often the heads of their houses, like

[1]Dom. David Knowles: *The Religious Orders in England*. Volume III: The Tudor Age. pp. xiv + 522. Cambridge University Press, 55s.

Prior William More of Worcester, spent much of the year on their manors where they lived like country gentlemen. Hence material well-being had become so important that when the dissolution came, abbots and priors were mainly concerned to secure comfortable pensions for themselves, and the rank and file, following their example, accepted their smaller pensions and gratuities, abandoning the way of life to which they were vowed.

The sufferings of the London Carthusians and of the few others who endured death or exile for the sake of conscience are described in a way that is the more impressive for its restraint and freedom from bitterness. It may be doubted, however, whether these martyrs were as much concerned for the interests of morality as Professor Knowles implies. For despite the sympathy felt for Katherine of Aragon, few well-informed people can have doubted that had she not been the emperor's aunt, and the pope not been in the emperor's power, Henry would not have sought his divorce in vain.

In discussing the dissolution and the treatment of the ex-Religious, Professor Knowles corrects the exaggerations of sentimentalists, whether apologists or romantics. He shows what precedents the suppressions under Wolsey could furnish and also how the monasteries were faring in contemporary Scandinavian countries which were adopting the Reformation, and makes it clear that the plan of suppressing all the English monasteries matured only slowly, mainly owing to the crown's need of the monastic wealth. Thus there was little or nothing of religious persecution in the business, and even those of Cromwell's agents with the worst reputations could show kindness and consideration—as Dr. London did at Godstow—when they could do so without endangering their own interests. This is not, of course, to suggest that the dissolution was accomplished without the infliction of much suffering or that the commissioners were not frequently harsh and rapacious. Nevertheless, after considering all the evidence, Professor Knowles concludes that, 'Few revolutions of comparable importance, whether in the sixteenth or in later centuries, have been accomplished with so little bloodshed or judicial barbarity. Indeed, throughout the process little or no animus was displayed against the Religious as such. It was their wealth that Henry and Cromwell wanted, not primarily or professedly the extinction of their order, though this was soon seen to be an inevitable consequence. The apologists of the monks, therefore, who have written of the reign of terror, or of the cruel tyranny of Cromwell, have misread the situation, or transferred to the sixteenth century in England the mentality of reformers and revolutionaries of other lands and times. It would be almost permissible to say that the king and his minister had no more ill-will towards the monks than the gay highwayman of legend had towards his victims' (p. 367).

To what extent Cromwell desired the triumph of Protestantism will perhaps always remain a matter of controversy, but even if his motive for dissolving the monasteries was as material as Professor Knowles supposes, there must have been an increasing number of Englishmen who felt that their disappearance would increase the chances in favour of the permanent establishment of the new religion. How right they were in this judgement is shown by Professor Knowles when he writes that 'had they [the monasteries] stood, the tide of Protestantism in this country would have been, if not halted, at least checked and divided' (p. 467).

However reluctantly the majority of the Religious may have aquiesced in the Reformation, their orders produced a number of notable men who whole-heartedly accepted and propagated the new faith. One of these was the future Bishop of Exeter, Miles Coverdale, whose translation of the Psalms still plays so important a part in Anglican worship. Of him Professor Knowles writes: 'He was a northerner and the parts of Lutheran teaching that most attracted him were those that most resembled the tenets of Wycliffe and the Lollards: zeal for the word of Scripture, hatred of images, and a disbelief in the value of a monastic or a vowed religious life' (p. 57). That a reformer of this type should be a northerner seems inconsistent with the traditional picture of the north as the stronghold of religious and political conservatism, but it will in no way surprise those who have read the work in which Professor Dickens traces the fortunes of the Reformation in the diocese of York down to the accession of Queen Elizabeth I.

The first part of this book[2] is a careful examination of all the trials for heresy in the diocese of York that took place during the reign of Henry VIII, those recorded in the Archbishops' Registers, in proceedings before the Council of the North, and in an act book of the Archbishop's Court of Audience, covering the years 1536 to 1543, all of this being material of which little use has been made hitherto. The people whose heresies may be studied in these sources were all comparatively humble: sailors, craftsmen, the master of the song school at Rotherham, and the like. When the beliefs with which they were charged, or which they confessed are analysed, they are found to be for the most part either distinctively Lollard or tenets which were common to both Lollards and Lutherans. Some denied that bread or water could be made holy by the priest. Several regarded confession to a priest as unnecessary, one, Richard Flynte, the parish clerk of Topcliff, alleging that it was a common saying in the region 'that a man might lift up his heart and confess himself to God without the mediation of a priest' (p. 48). Several denied transubstantiation. One Dutchman had a copy of the New Testament in his

[2]A. G. Dickens: *Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York 1509 to 1558*. pp. viii + 272. Oxford University Press, 30s.

native language, and several others had Tyndale's New Testament. When brought to trial, these heretics usually recanted and, after performing the enjoined penance, were reconciled to the church, though how far they had been genuinely converted from their errors, and how far they had merely been frightened into repudiating them, there is, of course, nothing to show.

Among the earliest to hold distinctively Protestant opinions were some younger members of the Yorkshire gentry, who probably picked up their ideas at the universities or at the Inns of Court. The most important of these men was Sir Francis Bigod. Professor Dickens devotes four chapters to the study of his career, portraying him convincingly as a zealous reformer, yet hampered both in thought and action by personal difficulties and by the traditions of the class to which he belonged. Bigod's part in the Pilgrimage of Grace Professor Dickens attributes to his disillusionment with the policy of Henry VIII and Cromwell as a means of effecting the reforms he desired, not to his abandonment of Protestant doctrine.

Other Yorkshire gentry with Protestant leanings to be considered are Wilfred Holme, whose views are expressed in his long poem on 'The fall and evil success of rebellion' written in 1537, and Robert Plumpton, whose two extant letters to his mother reveal something of the spirit of the early reformers at its best. 'Mother, you have much to thank God that it would please him to give you licence to live until this time, for the Gospel of Christ was never so truly preached as it is now' (p. 134).

The effects of the successive religious changes on the cathedral and parochial clergy and the laity are discussed at length and illustrated with a wealth of vivid detail, mainly drawn from local sources. The concealment of church ornaments, as well as the letters and diaries of some of the clergy, testify to the reluctance with which many of the changes were accepted. Conservative lay folk as well as clergy only slowly reconciled themselves to having married priests; on the other hand, many of the clergy from Archbishop Holgate downwards, and including a fair proportion of the ex-Religious, were quick to avail themselves of the Edwardian permission to marry, as is shown by the record of deprivations in the next reign. The Archbishop and other reforming clergy moreover, in spite of their failings, can be shown to have been more sincere and less avaricious than has commonly been supposed. Thus the future martyr, Robert Ferrar, when prior of St. Oswald's, desired to see the house converted into an educational and evangelistic institution and his letter to Cromwell, which has usually been described as a request for the Nostell lands for himself, proves on closer examination to be a plea for the adoption of his cherished plan (p. 149).

That there was much avarice and that the dissolution of the monasteries and chantries offered exceptional opportunities for its exercise is

of course freely recognized, but though, as Professor Knowles thinks, it facilitated the dissolution, the transfer of monastic property cannot be said to have created a vested interest in the Reformation. Professors Dickens and Knowles agree that Catholics were as eager as Protestants to acquire monastic lands and as tenacious of them, and, as Professor Dickens justly remarks, 'So long as the Marian government avoided the restoration of these lands to the church, the vested interest did not render, and had no reason to render, practical services to the Reforming cause' (p. 249).

A more important factor leading to the ultimate triumph of Protestantism was the attitude of the clergy. At the beginning of the revolution in religion, the Convocation of York seems to have been only a little less amenable than was that of Canterbury, its dispute with the king over the royal supremacy being, as Professor Dickens proves, 'very largely conducted by Tunstall and did not extend beyond the year 1531' (p. 158). If the leaders and representatives of the clergy showed little independence at this stage, the rank and file, as might have been expected, were even more docile:

> 'Throughout the successive vicissitudes of the mid-Tudor period almost every parish priest in the diocese placed conformity to the government before religious conservatism, strong as the latter instinct must have been with the majority. Some of them might shudder to think of souls in purgatory without masses—we know from their correspondence that this is true of Parkyn and his colleague, William Watson, of High Melton, and they might reverently bury the beautiful alabaster reredoses fashioned by the craftsmen of Nottingham and York. . . . Ten years later, even the ultra-conservative Parkyn was settling down to the Elizabethan Prayer Book at Adwick-le-Street, where he swallowed his prejudices and retained the curacy until his death in 1569' (pp. 183-184).

But though the success of Tudor governments in enforcing their ecclesiastical policies was no doubt due in part to the acquiescence of the clergy, the evidence adduced by Professor Dickens proves conclusively that 'against the generally conservative background of the thirties, forties and fifties Lollard and continental Protestant notions were more widely disseminated in the diocese of York than it has hitherto been customary, or indeed possible to suppose' (p. 242). The existence of 'a diffused but inveterate Lollardy' meant that 'the foreign seed fell upon a ground prepared for its reception and prepared by something more than anti-clericalism or royal propaganda' (p. 245).

The part played by Cambridge men in inspiring and directing the Reformation has always been recognized, and indeed throughout the sixteenth century there was no place in England where theological dogmas were more strenuously advocated and opposed, or points concerning discipline and ritual more hotly contested. Hence Mr. Porter's *Reforma-*

tion and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge[3] is an important contribution to the study of Reformation history as a whole.

The book owes much to the fact that its author is a Cambridge man with personal experience of the atmosphere of both senior and junior combination rooms, and familiar with the intricacies of college and university politics. For such personal experience has enabled him to see how the jealousies and loyalties of college and university life might influence conduct and opinions in matters of religion.

Mr. Porter follows the various religious controversies with great skill, combining a narrative of what happened with a very clear account of the thought from which the actions sprang in such a way as to make both the men and their ideas comprehensible. Thus he leads us from the liberal atmosphere of Erasmus through the Lutheran controversies to predestination at its harshest and most uncompromising, and on to the reaction most commonly associated with Launcelot Andrews, but perhaps most perfectly expressed in Benjamin Whichcote.

The joy in the revived study of the New Testament which, as we have seen, animated the correspondence of the young Robert Plumpton, had its academic counterpart in the enthusiasm with which lectures on this subject were heard at Cambridge. Thus Thomas Becon, recalling his undergraduate days, told of Stafford's lectures on Paul: 'He seemed of a dead man to make him alive again and . . . to set him forth in his native colours'. His lectures on the Gospels were no less inspiring: 'likewise did he learnedly set forth in his lectures the native sense and true understanding of the four evangelists, vively restoring unto us . . . the mind of those holy writers, which so many years before had lain hid unknown and obscured through the darkness and mists of the pharisees and papists' (p. 42). Later, the vestiarian controversy is described in all its bitterness and violence, hatred of the surplice so completely possessing one Fellow of St. John's that in a sermon preached in the college chapel he wished 'that if God would not, the Devil might take them away'. In the section on the Cambridge Puritans Mr. Porter follows eminent and typical exponents of that movement to their country parishes in England and in the new world, showing, among other things, how it came about that sermons preached at Cambridge played so large a part in forming the conscience of America.

There was much in the puritan way of life at its strictest that can hardly fail to move the modern reader to mirth, though the seemingly interminable prayers and sermons and godly conversation would seem more intelligible and not less conducive to spirituality than the austerities practiced by ancient and medieval saints. Mr. Porter, while not omitting what we should regard as the religious excesses of some puritans, such

[3]H. C. Porter: *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge*. pp. x + 461. Cambridge University Press, 52s. 6d.

as the practice of John Carter who 'prayed for five or six hours a day in his study very loud and mostly very long to give an example to his children' (p. 219) is careful to give more emphasis to the true greatness of the puritan clergy both as preachers and as pastors.

One of Mr. Porter's great merits is his ability to explain widely differing points of view with sympathy and understanding. It is only when he is dealing with such matters as the sale of church plate and vestments and the removal of the altar of Fisher's chantry at St. John's that a certain lack of sympathy may be detected. The destruction of beautiful things is, of course, always to be deplored, but it is hard to see how the men of the Reformation period could have acted otherwise than they did. The vestments and church plate were an integral part of the religious system which they rejoiced to have overthrown and which, especially after their experience of Mary's reign, they had good reason to fear might be reimposed. In these circumstances it was natural that they should seek to destroy whatever might help to keep the old religion alive in men's minds, regardless of its intrinsic beauty.

The books examined in this survey confirm, correct and complement one another at so many points that it may be regretted that their publication fell within too short a time for one to be able to influence another. But for that very reason it is important that all three works should be read by anyone wishing to understand the course of the English Reformation. The reader who resolves to follow this suggestion may look forward to many hours of enjoyment as well as of profit, for all three writers have brought to their tasks not only learning and historical imagination, but exceptional literary ability.

OUR DEBT TO DR. MAJOR*

By Canon C. E. Raven, F.B.A.

Ephesians iv, 15. 'No, let us speak the truth in love; so shall we fully grow up into Christ.'

St. Paul has just proclaimed the unity of mankind in faith and experience, its full manhood, its integration into the one body. He has immediately warned us against childish assent to every fad and foible, every fraud and falsehood. So he can point to our duty to speak the truth in love as the primary road to what Teilhard de Chardin calls Christification. This is the road that Henry Major followed, the road which he has summoned us to tread.

Many men of fourscore years and ten outlive their own achievements, and if they are holy and humble are easily misrepresented or forgotten. It is inevitable that our memories are associated with their later and less vigorous period, that as in Major's case we think rather of the quiet years of his Principalship on Boars Hill or his incumbency of Merton, of the wise and gentle friend and pastor rather than of the adventurer, the strategist, the warrior who created and sustained and directed the Modern Churchmen's movement in the first half of the century. You will forgive me then if as one of the few survivors who knew him, in his early days in the first Ripon Hall, who watched his success in changing the character of the place and then in moving it to Oxford and so in planning the signal achievement of the Girton Conference of 1921, I remind you of those half-forgotten days as constituting our primary debt to him.

Henry Major was, as we all know, a man of wide rather than specialized knowledge, who came over from New Zealand at a time when Oxford had in its Divinity Faculty a group of students of theology and of the Gospels of quite unique brilliance, Sanday and Headlam, Turner and Streeter and among the younger men the authors of *Foundations*. From them Major acquired his sense of the vital importance of history and of the details of New Testament criticism. We have been given by another student from overseas, the late Dean Sperry of Harvard, in his remarkable book *Jesus then and now*, a vivid testimony to the spiritual quality and the intellectual integrity of these men, as well as a very striking picture of the contrast between their profound scholarship and the shoddy and mythological dogmatizing of the neo-orthodoxy of today. Henry must, I think, have known long before his death how right he had been in forcing us all to face up to the historical evidence for the life and work and message of Jesus. He,

*Memorial Sermon given in St. Margaret Lothbury at the Annual Service of the Modern Churchmen's Union on 5 May, 1961.

like his teachers, knew the Gospels in a way that hardly any of us today can equal—now that form-criticism and eschatology, typology and mystery-religions and other fancies have made us sceptical of the Jesus of history and eager to replace him by our own subjectivities. Perhaps too he realised that the 'great blight' which fell upon Protestant Christendom in 1935 was already passing. But we who appreciate how immensely important was his constant stress upon the comparative age and authenticity of the documents cannot but be thankful that he so completely stripped himself of fundamentalism, so rigidly insisted upon exact scholarship and so loyally followed the resultant evidence in spite of all the outcries of traditionalists and authoritarians. His efforts gave to English evangelicals a modernism equally stringent in its methods with the modernism of Tyrrell and Loisy, though profoundly different from them in its results.

Strategically his second great benefit was the creation and siting of Ripon Hall. I well remember how as Vice-Principal of the evangelical training college at Ripon he constrained his Principal to accept critical views of Scripture and even of doctrine; and how with the loyal support of Bishop Boyd-Carpenter, most eloquent of prelates, and of Hastings Rashdall, Bethune-Baker and others he made the Hall a centre of liberal or, as he insisted on calling it, modern theology. It was not done without controversy; from time to time it seemed that he would be silenced or forced to resign. But he held on and gradually built up around him a very impressive body of scholarly theologians and philosophers, scientists and men of affairs.

Then after the war when the whole position of the Church was in danger he felt sure that only fearless facing of the facts of evil and suffering, and a valiant effort to find new presentations of the faith would avail; he also saw that Ripon was too remote and too unknown to provide the scene for his adventure, and in 1919, heroically moved the Hall to the site in Oxford opposite Wadham and now occupied by the University Library.

Two years later he followed up this challenge by mobilising a great panel of experts to discuss the central problems grouped under the title of 'Christ and the Creeds'. The Girton Conference heard speeches from clergy like Dean Rashdall, Dr. Barnes, Professor Bethune-Baker and Canon Glazebrook and laymen like Professor Gardner, Professor Sorley, Dr. Cyril Norwood and Dr. Douglas White and from younger men like R. H. Lightfoot, J. W. Hunkin, R. G. Parsons and C. W. Emmet—a team which could hardly have been equalled then or since. Reports were issued and debated in the whole press of the country. Controversy was general; abuse violent; and misrepresentation all too common. No Conference upon religion so honest in its statements, so searching in its enquiries and so inspiring in its measure of agreement,

has taken place in the past half-century. It had given a definite lead on the central theme of the Christian revelation, and opened the way to the reinterpretation of the Faith in terms congruous with experience and scholarship and appropriate to the cosmology, biology and psychology of the twentieth century. Major himself read a paper on the crucial subject 'Jesus, the Son of God' and in the September issue of the *Modern Churchman* which he edited, he prefixed to the collected papers an introduction in which he dealt brilliantly with the theme of the Conference and spoke with dignity and generosity about its quality, about the controversies to which it had given rise, and about the centrality and significance of its subject. Here as always when treating of Jesus he was at his best and could speak the truth in love.

His third gift for which we of today are specially in his debt was that even if the Churchmen's Union never again reached so prominent a position as at the Girton Conference, it served thereafter to hold together and encourage the truth, freedom and comprehensiveness of its objective, and at Ripon Hall to provide a training for ordinands which was at once intellectually distinguished and devotionally sincere. When the reaction against liberal theology and a reasonable faith, arising from the continental and American victims of economic and political despair, swept over the British Churches, and Barthian heresy challenged belief in any natural religion or any real indwelling of the Spirit, Major refused to compromise with its pessimism or to accept its Christology. His sweetness of temper, his total lack of careerism or of personal bitterness, and his profound reverence and godliness set an example not only to generations of his students but to his critics and adversaries. So when in 1938 the Commission on Doctrine set up originally under Bishop Burge issued its report, he was able to feel that at last the Church of England had recognised the validity of his chief convictions and had withdrawn its previous sneers at his orthodoxy and integrity. On the main issue that any profound belief in Jesus must involve acceptance of a true relationship and potential unity between God and man, and also a concept of the divine not in terms of power or wisdom but of love and creative communion, he had won his case.

Such is as it seems to me the three-fold nature of our obligation to him. How can we discharge it?

No one will doubt in view of the vast changes which recent events and discoveries have made inevitable that the study of Jesus and the attempt to formulate an adequate Christology still demand our closest attention. The amount of sub-Christian and often self-contradictory doctrine to be found even in official reports and utterances of Churchmen warns us how much of our traditional dogma is pre-Copernican or at least pre-Darwinian. We must carry on Major's work of New Testament exegesis and criticism as a chief acknowledgement of our debt.

But there are also other and correlated fields which demand our attention—and at least two of these Major hardly touched. All of us were at times surprised that one so liberal in religion could be so conservative, indeed so illiberal, in his social and political thinking. Only those who know New Zealand as it was in his youth can realise how totally strange to him was the condition of Britain as a result of a century of *laissez-faire*, snobbishness and over-population. He came from an earthly paradise, free from poverty or millionaires, and happy in its cheerful and unrestricted individualism. He never (I think) realised that our greatest evils are diseases not of particular people but of the body politic—evils from which the Christian cannot keep himself unspotted and which by himself he can never wholly cause or cure. Community, mutual interdependence, were concepts with which he was never deeply concerned. And for modern man they become every year more urgent.

So too with the world of science. In his early days I doubt if he ever understood that for honest and intelligent youngsters it was almost impossible to be both a scientist and a Christian—except by the device of segregating the two elements of one's nature in a schizophrenic dualism. Even when radical changes in physics and psychology broke down the old 'closed universe' he hardly seemed to be interested in what has been to many of us an inevitable field of research and discussion. Of the fundamental importance of the problems great and small that our new knowledge of nature must raise for the thoughtful Christian, he seemed hardly conscious—and yet, as every educationalist surely knows, the agnostic if not atheistic humanism of the western world is almost as universal among men and women of middle age as is Marxism among the rulers of Russia. There is not so much animosity as of old; indeed co-operation is easy and often welcomed: but the Church has a vast field for effort and reinterpretation if any full agreement is to be reached.

In these two tasks at least and in Dr. Major's memory we too must speak the truth in love and grow up in Christ.

REVELATION: CHRISTIAN AND HINDU

By D. Howard Smith
Lecturer in Comparative Religion, University of Manchester

Christianity claims to be in possession of a final truth, mediated by Divine revelation, deposited in a Church and a sacred scripture, and therefore authoritative. In recent years this claim has been subjected to searching criticism by philosophers and scientists, and not least by the apologists for other great world-religions. To meet the challenge of these criticisms the minds of many leading theologians—N. Soderblom, A. E. Taylor, W. Temple, J. Maritain, E. Brunner, N. Berdyaev, J. Ballie, H. H. Farmer, Karl Barth, R. Bultmann and others—representing many diverse schools of Christian thought, have been greatly exercised with the problems involved. Some of these works reveal the danger that, in emphasising the uniqueness and finality of 'revealed truth', the theologian may be led to abrogate the claims of reason, maintaining with Kierkegaard that 'the absurd is the object of faith, and the only object that can be believed'.[1]

More intimate contact with and understanding of other great world-religions has revealed that they too lay claim to be repositories of revealed, and therefore authoritative, truth. This is true of Islam. It is also true of Hinduism. All schools of orthodox Hinduism accept the Veda as authoritative scripture, the final and perfect source of revealed truth. This claim of Hinduism, and indeed of other non-Christian religions, to be the repository of 'revealed truth' poses serious questions for the Christian theologian. Are these claims made by non-Christian religions false? Or have they only partial validity as compared with the Christian revelation? Or is every claim to 'finality' in revealed truth, including the Christian claim, untenable? If not, how are the claims made by the adherents of various great world-religions to be interpreted?

Great Hindu thinkers have not been unmindful of the metaphysical and epistemological problems raised by the claim that the Vedas are 'revealed truth'. In early days the refusal of Jainism and Buddhism to accept their authority was largely responsible for the Hindu refusal to accept these religious systems as orthodox. Within the six main schools of Hindu orthodoxy there was, however, wide diversity of opinion as to what is meant by 'revelation', and as to how the authority of the Veda is to be understood. On many important issues Mimamsa and Nyaya reached diametrically opposite conclusions. It was Advaita (non-dualistic) Vedanta which came to exercise the profoundest influence on Hindu scholarship, and, in particular, the great philosopher Sankara (*c.* 8th century A.D.) whose commentaries on the Veda might, perhaps, be compared in their formulative influence to the 'Summa' of Thomas Aquinas.

[1]Cf. R. Bretan, *A Kierkegaard Anthology*. Princeton, 1946, p. 221.

K. Satchidananda Murty, a modern Hindu scholar, who is greatly indebted to western and Christian scholarship, has made a careful study of *Reason and Revelation in Advaita Vedanta*.[2] The first part of his work is an exposition of the Advaita concepts of God, Revelation, scriptural testimony and interpretation; followed in the second part by a discussion of the function of reason in Advaita. He then goes on to study, briefly, the five remaining systems of Hindu orthodoxy, with special reference to man's knowledge of God, and the nature of scriptural (Vedic) authority. These first three sections of the book, devoted to exposition, are interesting in that they reveal that, though religions which have an Indian origin differ so fundamentally in some of their aspects from those which arose out of a Semitic background, the metaphysical and epistemological problems often find solutions along almost identical lines.

In the Vedic Samhitas and the Upanisads it is possible already to distinguish two trends of thought—monistic idealism and monotheism. The existence of God was not treated as if it were a truth to be demonstrated. God is seen by reason of His grace alone, intuited by the seer because He is the light of man's reason, revealed to the inward consciousness through study of and meditation upon the Vedas (p. 187). But in later times, when Buddhism, Jainism and the atheistic Carvaka philosophy arose, the existence of God and the Atman was doubted, and there arose the need for an apologetic. Whereas the authority of the Veda and the existence of God had been accepted, they now had to be proved. Two streams of thought were crystallized in the Mimamsa and the Nyaya. The former tried to counter scepticism, materialism and relativism in morals by attempting to prove that there was an eternal scripture, free from all possible defects, and therefore authoritative. The latter attempted to prove God's existence on rational grounds, and to justify the authority of scripture as God's word. The teleological and cosmological arguments of the Nyaya school were attacked by Buddhists and Mimamsakas, who anticipated by hundreds of years the arguments of Hume and Kant (p. 207).

Prof. Murty points out (p. 219, p. 232), what is all too often overlooked, that it was the undoubted opinion of the greatest authorities such as Badarayana, Jaimini, Sankara and Kumrila that the Veda is *the only true scripture*, and that the Vedic faith is as exclusive as the Semitic faiths and brooks no rivals. Modern exponents of Hinduism who say 'All religions are true' do so on their own authority, and do not represent orthodox Hindu tradition. Jayanta (10th century A.D.) seems to have represented a more eirenical spirit, holding that all scriptures, including those of the Buddhists and Jains, are authoritative, and, being so, must be the work of God. But he goes on to suggest that, though God is the

[2]K. Satchidananda Murty, *Reason and Revelation in Advaita Vedanta*. Waltair: Andhra Univ. & New York: Columbia Univ. 1959. Rs. 25. pp. xix + 365.

author of all scriptures, He has shown His compassion to a greater number of people through the Vedic faith. It is true that scriptures seemingly contradict one another, but so do many Vedic passages.

In the final section of his work Prof. Murty makes a trenchant criticism of Advaita metaphysics, theology and theory of 'Vedic revelation'. It is this part of the book which should prove of particular interest to the Christian theologian, not only because the author comes down heavily in favour of a theistic as opposed to a purely monistic interpretation of reality, but because of his criticisms of verbal inspirationism, neo-fundamentalism, and all attempts to prove that one particular or 'special' revelation is essentially different in kind, *sui generis*, and of absolute and universal validity.

He criticises the absolute non-dualism of Sankara, because, if it is accepted, there is no sense in saying that the one eternal consciousness (Brahman), without a second, reveals itself. There is no one else to whom it could reveal anything. A revelation without a revealer or a recipient is unintelligible. Sankara tries to overcome this difficulty by affirming that, from an absolute standpoint, there is no scripture and no knowledge of Brahman. Only from an empirical standpoint do both exist. Advaita Vedanta, says the author, 'seems to lead to the absurd conclusion that an illusory individual illusorily knows from an illusory scripture that what he previously regarded as "himself" is an illusion, and that he is something other than "himself" ' (p. 248). The author makes a penetrating criticism of the Advaita position in regard to the God-concept (pp. 258-268) and goes on to argue that a belief in a personal God is not unjustified, and that on the basis of theism the idea of a 'revelation' made by a personal God to human beings is not incredible. If there is God, it is logically possible that He may have composed a scripture and communicated it to mankind through sages and prophets. But revelation through a particular book or person cannot be judged genuine without a prior knowledge of God derived independently of that book or person. Thus, there can be no 'special' revelation without general revelation. In this the author criticises both Sankara and Barth. 'It is an intolerable idea that God exclusively disclosed Himself to one people and left others in darkness. In its motive and in its consequences this claim is disastrous for men' (p. 272). Denial of general revelation coupled with the assertion of a unique revelation will make of the latter a miracle which has no contact or continuity with either the past or the present.

The view of the Verbal Inspirationists that any error in a scripture would destroy its trustworthiness as a whole presupposes that the vehicles and the recipients of revelation are mere mechanical instruments without any personal responsibility. Such a mechanical view of 'revelation' is unacceptable.

In regard to God's revelation of Himself through incarnation, the

author is surely right in insisting that it is for history to say whether a particular event occurred or not, but that it is only faith that can take it as an event which discloses God in a more direct way than other events. Faith is the only possible witness to an incarnation. It is personal conviction which makes a man able to say, I know this from God Himself, and he cannot give to others any adequate proof for his belief (pp. 279-280).

The conclusion reached by Prof. Murty is that Divine revelation is a kind of awareness, which is essentially similar to our awareness of ourselves and our neighbours. Since what is known is God, a person, and since that person cannot be known 'objectively', but by his own disclosure through his activity, our awareness of God is his self-revelation. Nobody is deprived of this revelation, and unless there is such a general revelation the claims of many world religions to be in possession of special revelations is unintelligible. Revelation takes for granted man's freedom, depends upon the whole activity of man, and presupposes that he can think and will. Revelation is not a one-sided activity on the part of God. The position of the Barthians that revelation is neither an idea nor events, but the 'Einmalige' (the unique) is unacceptable, for such revelation would lie outside our categories. The result would be that nothing intelligible could be said about it—the position of the Logical Positivists.

Prof. Murty attacks the various attempts to uphold the Christian belief that the revelation of God in Christ is the final, perfect and unique revelation. 'Those', he says, 'with an intimate acquaintance with the living religion of Bhakti, as practised by many Vaisnavas in India, cannot accept the claim that God has revealed himself in the personality of Christ alone' (p. 292). He suggests two possible criticisms of the position taken up in the Lambeth Report of 1930[3] that only one religion can be the *complete* truth, and that other religions are partial truths, being approaches to the truth of God revealed in Christ. In the first place, if we remember that man's role is not passive, and that God does not thrust a once-for-all complete truth on man, but one that is suited to his finite mind and social environment, no revelation of the inexhaustible mystery of God can be complete. In the second place, it is only possible to say that one religion *fulfils* all other religions if one ignores the differences in spirit and ethos that distinguish the many great religions of the world. Each religion has its own distinctive quality, and none of them can be called 'approaches' or 'steps' to any one of them. As Troeltsch says, the Absolute lies beyond history and 'to wish to have the Absolute in history in an absolute form at a single point is a piece of foolishness' (p. 294).

To some theologians the revelation contained in their own religious tradition lacks authority unless it excludes further revelations *after* it.

[3] p. 75.

To them the significance of Christianity lies in the affirmation that it is the last and final revelation. The author quotes with approval N. Soderblom, 'It is absurd to look upon revelation as finished with Christ',[4] and Berdyaev, 'When men maintain that the revelation of the truth which must bestow real freedom is final and complete, they fall into the wiles of anti-Christ'[5] (p. 295).

To the argument that, though in all revelations there is intimated an apprehension of God, one of these revelations alone can be the *classic pattern* or *archetype* of all other revelations, the author asks on what basis can Christianity be accepted as the norm for judging all other religions save on the basis of personal experience and conviction?

Prof. Murty believes that there can be no 'finality of revelation' in any of the above senses. Each revelation is 'absolute' to its own receivers. What then of the mutual contradictions between religions? Do these not prove that no more than one religion can be absolute? But is there any point in affirming the absolute superiority of Christianity over all other religions? Is it not a purely academic question? For our finite, human condition makes it inevitable that God limits the revelation of Himself to the receptivity of the believer.

In all religions some authority seems to be inevitable. Total rejection of the authority of tradition results in the destruction of the foundation of religion. Yet when men attempt to formulate the contents of a revelation in dogmas, those dogmas cannot be a final authority because a concept can never express all that was intended, and the content of a concept changes with time.

Indian religion agrees with Christianity in insisting that the supreme goal of religion is the beatific vision, to 'know God'. Sankara, Ramanuja and Madhva all insisted that religion should not be confounded with morality. Moral behaviour can only be a means for preparing men for right vision, and the ultimate aim is to obtain right vision of Brahman. But religious knowledge must not be confounded with scientific knowledge. Yet those who urge that an irrational doctrine can be held by faith, because faith is different from reason, should remember that man is a whole who cannot be torn asunder. Prof. Murty criticises Kierkegaard who maintained that the absurd is the object of faith and the only object that can be believed (p. 322). A man cannot make himself believe what his reason tells him is not so. He may accept that human perception and reason are fallible, but he cannot ignore what he believes to be established evidence. It is pointed out that Indian philosophy failed to distinguish between what 'contradicts' and what is 'above' reason. For both the same term 'viruddha' was used. When it is said that knowledge of God, which religion affirms, is not contradicted by reason, that

[4] *The Living God*, p. 351.
[5] *Truth and Revelation*, p. 72.

does not mean that it can be comprehended or given rational proof. Here the position of Advaita Vedanta is fundamentally sound, for it holds that Brahman cannot be proved, but it maintains that what is said of Brahman is not meaningless. Though reason cannot demonstrate the ultimate truth about God it has a positive role in clarifying the contents of God's revelation. Thus the so-called 'proofs' of God's existence support theism, provided that we possess a knowledge of God derived through a personal appropriation of revelation.

REVIEWS

ECCLESIA SCOTIANA

Here is something we have long been waiting for: a straightforward, objective, and reasonably exhaustive *Church History of Scotland*,[1] written by an expert, but unencumbered by lengthy footnotes and appendices; something, in fact, for the intelligent general reader. Its publication coincides with the fourth centenary of the Reformation in Scotland; and hence the bulk of this book is necessarily concerned with what happened after 1560. None the less Professor Burleigh's account of the early Celtic missions and their subsequent development, under various pressures, into the typical medieval ecclesiastical system is clear and adequate, and drives home the lesson that until well into the sixteenth century the Papacy, often in opposition to the Crown, exercised a firm and continuous grip even upon so outlying and barbaric a dependency as Scotland. The heresies of Wyclif and the Lollards made but little impact upon Scotland; and the furious efforts of Henry VIII to export the English Reformation were successfully countered by Cardinal Beaton and Mary of Lorraine with the French Alliance. Inevitably, however, Protestantism began to seep into the Northern Kingdom both from England and Scotland; and the opposition came to a head in the person of John Knox, whose return to his native land in May 1559 precipitated 'the uproar for religion'. The following year Parliament accepted Knox's 'Scots Confession', and abolished the jurisdiction and authority of the Pope. This was the beginning of a long and bitter struggle, lasting for more than a hundred and fifty years, at first against the old Roman Faith, and then against the encroachments of the episcopate, supported by the Crown, which sought desperately to subject Presbyterianism to its will. In that, indeed, James VI of Scotland and I of England very largely succeeded. 'In his conflict with the Kirk', writes Professor Burleigh, 'James had won a notable victory even before 1603, which his elevation to the throne of England enabled him to exploit. . . . So far as Scotland was concerned he had almost succeeded in introducing the ecclesiastical system of Henry VIII, in which the king was pope'.

Victory was turned into defeat by the high-handed methods and incredible blunders of his successor that aroused widespread opposition, which culminated in the acceptance by all classes of the National Covenant. For a brief period the Covenanters carried all before them, and even, through the Solemn League and Covenant and the Westminster Confession, imposed their will upon England. But their triumph was short-lived. They became divided among themselves; and Cromwell occupied the whole of Scotland, treating it as conquered territory, and enforcing toleration for the Sectaries, 'whose conscience was not satisfied with that form (i.e. prebyterianism) and bade them worship in other Gospel ways'.

The Restoration meant, of course, a return to episcopacy; for, as Charles II put it succinctly, 'Presbyterianism was no religion for a gentleman'. Under the guidance of Robert Leighton and the Earl of Lauderdale, however, Church government was directed with moderation, toleration and sweet reasonableness. Yet nothing satisfied the extreme Cameronians, who declared open war and brought down upon their heads Claverhouse and his dragonades, thereby exciting so much bitterness that when the wheel of fortune introduced the Revolution of 1688 the episcopal clergy in their turn were 'rabbled' out of their manses and parishes. Episcopacy, in fact, became so closely identified with Jacobitism, that Presbyterianism, by its loyalty to the Revolution Settlement, had little difficulty in establishing itself as the Church of Scotland.

[1] *A Church History of Scotland*, by J. H. S. Burleigh. Oxford University Press. 1960. 42/-.

During the eighteenth century the 'Moderates', who were erastian and latitudinarian, held power and used it not unsuccessfully to heal the scars of battle. William Robertson, their great leader, indeed claimed that he had brought to the Church 'tranquillity of order consonant with the times'. Such tranquillity was shattered by the Evangelical Revival, which in Scotland as elsewhere introduced much new spiritual life, besides a great deal of controversy. This last came to a head in the famous 'Disruption' of 1843, when, taking their stand on the Westminster Confession with its claim to spiritual freedom from the State, Dr. Chalmers and 145 ministers quitted the Establishment and set up a Free Church of their own. This prospered and constituted a serious rival to the Church of Scotland; the more so when in 1900 it became united with that other great dissenting body, the United Presbyterian Church. Thus was gathered 'into one great river the streams of dissatisfaction that had since the Revolution Settlement at various times and for various reasons flowed out of the Church by law established'. It had been freely prophesied by its enemies that the Establishment itself would wilt and die; but, instead, under able leadership, it took on a new lease of life: securing the abolition of patronage in 1847; promoting church extension and endowment; modifying the more sterile doctrines of the Westminster Confession; enriching public worship; and bestirring itself in the work of evangelism. In the end, despite much initial bitterness and the stumbling-block of Establishment, a way was found back in 1929 to a united Church, after an Enabling Act had recognised the Church's right to govern its own affairs; and a Church of Scotland's Properties and Endowments Bill had handed over to a central body of church trustees its churches, manses, glebes, teinds and other revenues. Professor Burleigh concludes his survey with a brief account of the recent failure to promote union with the Church of England. This foundered on the rock of episcopacy and the non-recognition by Anglicans of the validity of Presbyterian Sacraments. 'On the surface it has appeared that Presbyterians were giving away everything and Anglicans nothing'. But it is worth recalling that whereas there is in England an obnoxious plant known as 'ground-Elder', in Scotland it is called 'Bishops' weed'.

This is a massive book, authoritative and impartial; and is likely to remain the standard work on Scottish Church History for very many years to come.

A. Tindal Hart

POLITICS OF AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM

This detailed study[1] was originally a thesis written in the History Department of Harvard University under the title 'The Protestant Social Liberals in America, 1919-41'. The 413 pages of text are followed by 43 pages of detailed notes and an 11 page bibliography. The author is now Associate Professor of History at the University of California, Los Angeles. At first glance one is tempted to groan at what appears to be a typical doctoral thesis blown out into a huge, indigestible treatise, but first impressions are wrong, and the fact that special acknowledgement is made to the help and interest of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Junior, is an indication that it is in fact a work of distinction. It is concerned with the theological approach to political issues of leading American 'social gospel' thinkers from the Peace Settlement of 1919 to Pearl Harbour in 1941, and in particular with the challenge to that group by Reinhold Niebuhr in the thirties, and their reaction to him and to the stirring events of that decade and the advent of the second world war. Kirby Page, A. J. Muste, Harry Ward, F. Ernest Johnson (and the Federal Council of Churches) and Charles Clayton Morrison (and the *Christian*

[1] *The Protestant Search for Political Realism 1919-1941*, by Donald B. Meyer. pp. 482. University of California Press. 1960. $6.75.

Century) are the names that occur throughout, whilst that of Reinhold Niebuhr dominates the last part of the book. Among others whose thought crops up periodically are Sherwood Eddy, John Bennett, Paul Tillich and Richard Niebuhr.

The book is, therefore, a detailed study of an episode in the history of ideas. It is, in fact, an unusual subject for a 'straight' historian to undertake. The nearest analogy in this country would be if a history don undertook a survey of the political thought of the Christendom Group. I quote this not because its ideas were like those of the post-Rauschenbusch American 'social gospel' theologians (we had no similar group in this country) but because it was our nearest comparable *group*. Unfortunately no academic historian in this country thinks of tackling such tasks, though in another field we have had Professor Butterfield's notable *The Origins of Modern Science*.

Professor Meyer is obviously quite at home in theological discourse and thus well qualified to analyse the borderland between theology and social and political philosophy, with one aspect of which his book deals. He marshals his detailed material well and keeps the proportions of his study in hand. He has no obvious axe to grind and works towards a brief and enigmatic conclusion. Indeed the writing, though lively and carrying the reader on, is inclined to be enigmatic throughout, and one is frequently in doubt as to the precise significance of particular sentences, though the general tenor is clear. The heart of the book is concerned with the fact that the serious criticisms by 'neo-orthodoxy' (represented in particular by Reinhold Niebuhr) of the 'social gospel' thought, which the economic depression of 1929 onwards reinforced, seemed to be turned by the relative success of the New Deal. This appeared a liberal way out of the dilemma posed by 'neo orthodoxy' in its earlier statements by Reinhold Niebuhr. Later—as even the titles of his books show—Niebuhr was to help Americans to understand the pragmatic character of their political practice at a much more profound level, drawing inspiration from St. Augustine (among others) in the process.

It is very valuable to see Niebuhr in such detail through American eyes and against the American scene. He influenced Britain in the thirties more than America and it is easy to see why. He was in close touch with the European situation and wrote relevantly to it from the beginning. But the relative success of the New Deal and the greater economic strength of the American economy made it harder for Americans to see the point (which indeed he expressed at that stage too simply in semi-Marxist terms). From the great interventionist debate of 1939-41 he has written himself much more obviously into the American scene, so that now he is thought by some not to be sufficiently resilient to enter thoroughly into the situation of Christians in East Germany, or Asia. But Dr. Meyer's study stops at 1941.

Although very fully documented the non-American reader must be ready to know the significance of names like la Follette, Owen D. Young, Gerard Swope and Daniel Roper without further explanation. The book is expensive, and there is no sign of an English edition, so it is likely to be confined to libraries in this country, but it is worth while seeing that libraries have it.

RONALD PRESTON

THE OFFICIAL OPPOSITION*

Protestant Non-Conformity is in a sense the official opposition to Anglicanism in this country; although only once in its history has it successfully ousted the 'government' and taken over the reins of power itself. None the less this could happen again; given, of course, a sufficient revival in zeal and numbers; and assuming that the Church of England, dominated by a short-sighted, doctrinaire,

**English Religious Dissent*, by Erik Routley. Cambridge University Press. 1960. 18/6.

'Catholic' majority, were to force Disestablishment upon a reluctant Parliament. Such a divorce of Church and State might easily precipitate a splitting up of Anglicanism into its component parts of Anglo-Catholics, Evangelicals and Liberals; with a subsequent alliance between the last two and Dissent, which could well constitute an 'alternative Government'. Some churchmen and most dissenters would welcome that type of amalgamation.

Protestant Dissent did not begin at the Reformation. It has been latent in British Christianity from the very start, with the opposition of Celt to Roman, of the patriotic Englishman to the encroachments of the Medieval Papacy, and of the rationalistic thinker to ecclesiastical obscurantism. This opposition came to a head in the fourteenth century in the person of John Wyclif, whose teaching based on patriotism, rationalism and evangelical holiness found its imitators on the Continent, notably John Huss. Europe in its turn influenced English Dissent through the Renaissance with its startling demand for the individual freedoms of deprived groups. The Reformation to Henry VIII probably meant little more than a political break with the Pope; but to many of his protestant subjects it spelt the opportunity for religious revolution. For English Lollardy had links with Dutch Anabaptism, and the fruits of their marriage were the Puritan Separatists and Independents, who repudiated the alliance of Church and State, and regarded the claim of the monarch to be Head of the Church as nothing short of blasphemy. Personal holiness, freedom of mind and 'the Bible says' constituted their rule of life, along with a denial that 'the World' had any right to interfere in their affairs. Robert Browne indeed maintained that 'only proved Christians can constitute a Church. . . . Holiness is inseparable from the gathered and covenanted Church and Christians must be separated uncompromisingly from the World'. The assertion of these doctrines could and did lead to a charge of treason, and several prominent Brownists were hanged at Tyburn in 1593 on that very count. 'Conformist puritans, on the other hand, who sought to reform and change the Church from within, saw their hopes dashed at the Hampton Court Conference, where James I amplified his historic epigram 'no bishop no king' by informing Dr. John Reynolds, 'if this be all your party hath to say . . . I will harry them out of the land'. Out of the land the Brownists and Independents went, first to the Continent and then to the New World. However, after the Great Rebellion many of these exiles returned; and, backed by Cromwell's army, established the 'independent' sects of Baptists, Congregationalists and Quakers in opposition to the triumphant Presbyterians.

Despite the persecutions inaugurated at the Restoration, Dissent continued to flourish. It flourished because although those persecutions were cruel, they were very far from being effective, merely stimulating growth and unity, and confirming Non-Conformity in its now clearly defined rôle as an official opposition. Furthermore political events quickly compelled a toleration; and, under fears of a Roman menace, very nearly stampeded the Church into a comprehension. This last was successfully sabotaged by the high fliers; but in the crucial years that followed the Revolution of 1688 Non-Conformity and the Whig Party joined forces, won the war against France and prevented a Jacobite Restoration. So when 'George in pudding time came in and moderate men looked big, sir' a situation was created wherein the Whig Administration showed by its actions in silencing Convocation and refusing to sanction ecclesiastical reforms that Dissent must not be provoked. But as the eighteenth century went on the latter lost much of its ancient fervour, became infected with rationalism and deism, and produced the Unitarians. From such apathy, decay and ineffectiveness it was rescued by the Methodist Movement and the Evangelical Revival, which gave to it a new spiritual

zeal and zest; whilst the Industrial Revolution brought an unexampled prosperity. Subsequently the nineteenth century saw a great expansion of Protestant Dissent in every walk of life. Non-conformists began to play an important part in the foreign mission field, in politics where they founded the Liberal and Labour Parties on a bed-rock of conscience, in education, and in social reform. The dissenting meeting house gave place to all the pomp and circumstance of the large chapel, with its elaborate musical services and a type of worship far removed from that of the primitive and austere puritan.

This growth in numbers, wealth, prestige and enthusiasm naturally bred fear and dismay in the hearts of tories and churchmen, particularly as they watched the famous Board of lay Dissenting Deputies steadily whittle away all the non-conformists' disabilities, and eventually lead an attack in Parliament against the Establishment itself. The Establishment survived that assault, although both in Ireland and Wales it succumbed, and today dissenting pressures have eased. For too rapid growth led first to divisions and then to decline; and the middle of the twentieth century finds Non-Conformity weak both in numbers and prestige, whilst all too eager to co-operate with Anglicanism in such fields as the ecumenical movement, msisions and social problems. Less politically minded and class-conscious than of yore, both Anglican and Dissenter are shedding their old antagonisms and drawing rapidly nearer one another in Christian fellowship. None the less Non-Conformity remains as before the official opposition, keeping the 'government' on its toes, and offering a possible 'alternative' should the Church of England ever fail the nation.

Dr. Routley has written a stimulating and provocative book. The attempt to compress the History of Dissent from Roman times to the present day within the compass of 200 pages is ambitious indeed, and an ambition which at times tends to over-leap itself, since inevitably it entails serious omissions, over-simplifications and some ill-advised snap judgements. It is based moreover entirely upon well-known printed sources, drawn from a limited bibliography. But these are minor blemishes. Impartial, lucid, informative and provocative, this is an important work which should stimulate student and general reader alike to probe deeper into the History of Dissent.

A. Tindal Hart

HEBREW RELIGION*

This abridged translation of the first seven vols. of the history of Israelite religion, published in Hebrew between 1937 and 1948, deals only with pre-exilic religion; but for Kaufmann this was the period of Israel's religious creativity, and to it he assigns most of the Old Testament literature. The translator omits material that is mainly concerned with literature—except that of the Pentateuch and some of the prophets—and discussions of disputed points and documentation. The book has three main sections: the character of Israelite religion, the history of Israelite religion prior to classical prophecy, and classical prophecy.

The book is essentially polemical and it is instructive to notice where a critical view is rejected 'in toto', or called groundless, scholarly romancing, ungrounded analogizing, or a baseless contention of modern criticism. In the first part the author shows why he rejects the critical view that 'on the popular level there was no essential difference between the pre-exilic Israelite and the pagan': the Bible is utterly unaware of the nature and meaning of pagan religion; it knows no mythology nor anything of the character or function of pagan deities;; idols are bearers of occult powers, fetishes, but no pagan deity is personal or living; from

*_The Religion of Israel_, by Y. Kaufmann. Allen and Unwin. 1961. pp. 486. 42/-.

the earliest period contrary features, which in paganism constitute opposing divine realms, are united in YHWH, who is supreme over all, absolute controller of all magic. Even popular religion believed in the universal rule of YHWH and the national-territorial limitation of his favour, self-revelation and cult.

In the second part the author accepts the analysis of the Torah into three main sources, but he gives them as JE, P, D, and attempts to show that the Torah literature was uninfluenced by the classical prophets; but he admits that the contradictions between Ezekiel and P show that in the prophet's time the priestly writings had not crystallized into definite, final form; ancient collections of priestly writings, of which Ezekiel's laws were part, were in existence, and Ezekiel was attempting to bring these ancient laws, including P, up to date. Deuteronomy was the programme of reform conceived by the Abiathar priesthood, composed from their traditions after the death of Manasseh. Israel's religion was born not on the totemistic level but in the high cultural environment of the theistic religions of Egypt, Babylonia and Canaan; it was a spiritual revolution brought by the creative genius of Moses, who first drew the line between the people of YHWH and a pagan world ignorant of Him; this revolution brought the death of paganism in Israel.

In the literary prophets Israel's religion reached a new height; their moral and historical presuppositions grew from popular religion, but they first conceived the primacy of morality over cult. The author gives his reasons for believing that the text—apart from its arrangement—of the prophecies was not adapted by later hands. He finds two Hoseas as well as two Isaiahs, and attempts to solve the problems of Ezekiel by emphasising the 'fantasy' in his teaching.

Academically, Kaufmann's book takes its place among the many modern books which attempt a Hegelian synthesis between critical and conservative views; it opposes new theories to old ones, and on almost every page there are statements needing separate monographs to justify them. Perhaps a reason why Old Testament studies lag behind those of Natural Science is a lack of a forum where theories can receive tolerant, constructive criticism from scholars who love truth rather than support of their own theories. Religiously, the book is interesting and stimulating; it breathes a living faith of an 'apostolic prophet'.

J. N. Schofield

ETHICS AND THEOLOGY

In this book,[1] based on Cadbury lectures in the University of Birmingham and on three lectures at King's College, London, Professor Maclagan examines various ways of asserting that morality logically depends on religious or on theological support. (He does not question that there may be contingent connections, such as that the notion of respect for persons may have come to us through Christian religious teaching.) He defines morality in its barest essentials as the belief that we have duties which we can elect to respect or disregard in practice. This leads to the notion of the moral will as the pure will to do our duty. With other moralists in a (broadly) Kantian tradition, Professor Maclagan has little difficulty in showing that the view which defines duty as God's command can be shown to be sub-moral unless there is an antecedent judgement that what God commands is right and that we have a duty to do what God commands; and in this case the notion of moral duty is still antecedent to and not logically dependent on the theological assertion.

The most original part of the book, to my mind, is the examination of the notion of grace as 'constitutive' of acts of good will, or as 'enabling' them. This,

[1] *The Theological Frontier of Ethics*, by W. G. Maclagan. George Allen and Unwin. pp. 202. 28/-.

Professor Maclagan holds, is morally unsatisfactory, as destroying the pure act of will to do one's duty. (He convincingly attacks the view which represents the will to do one's duty as a form of spiritual pride.) He allows that there may be 'environmental' aids to the will such as are given by other people's encouragement, but, if there is to be morality, these cannot take the place of our own act of will. While in principle sympathetic to Professor Maclagan's position, I think more needs to be said here on how far I can know that any particular moral decision was 'all my own' and how much it owed to the encouragement and criticism of other people, not to speak of my hereditary gifts and defects. This is not to speak deterministically, but it is to question how far we can say just where our own effort begins and these other very subtle and intimate influences end, and thus to find it more difficult than Professor Maclagan seems to do to distinguish between the 'will' and the 'wider self' or 'person'. We should indeed set ourselves to do our duty; but how do we sometimes owe not only to people who encourage us, but to people who batter us into trying harder than we believed we could? If we are to admit a notion of grace at all, may it be something like a power of growth in moral strength (not however exclusively moral) which comes not just of our choosing and which may work through all these influences? I do not underestimate the difficulty in thinking of grace as a kind of para-physical force; and in any case I think 'immanentist' ways of talking are due for a thorough examination. Professor Maclagan is aware of the difficulty of making sense of immanentist language, and he carefully avoids it. This, along with his concern for the integrity of morality, brings him to a view of religion as a way of ardently expressing a loyal response to the moral demand upon us. What lays the demand? It will not do just to say a transcendent person, if the integrity of our moral will is to be upheld. Professor Maclagan suggests we should think rather of a realm or order of values, which can be embodied in historic processes through the ideals in which we seek to envisage them. I think I can see what is meant by talking of values as *possibilities* of goodness, etc., which can be genuinely better and worse, and which we can recognize an obligation to realize. But the (Platonic?) notion of the existence of a 'realm of values' as such is hard to understand. On p. 192 Professor Maclagan speaks of values as 'supra-actual'. Here is an expression which surely needs the sort of trenchant examination which Professor Maclagan has so well given to some of the theological forms of expression.

Dorothy Emmet

University of Manchester.

POWER IN AFRICA

However great the problems resulting from the emergence to nationhood of Ghana, Nigeria, Gold Coast and the Congo, Africa's most intractable problems concern those areas where a large number of whites have colonised and settled to form politically and economically dominant minorities. Few, indeed, are those who believe that the *status quo* can and must be maintained. The concept of partnership within a multi-racial society, with equality of human rights for all, seems to offer the only feasible solution. It was hoped that the establishment of the Central African Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland in 1953 would lead to the gradual growth of such a partnership, but the next step forward is in danger of shipwreck through the intransigence of the white settlers on the one hand, and the virulent demands of black nationalism on the other.

Professor Franck, in the fifteen chapters of this book,[1] offers a wise, thorough,

[1]Thomas M. Franck. *Race and Nationalism: the Struggle for Power in Rhodesia and Nyasaland.* Allen and Unwin. 1960. 369 pp. 30/-.

independent and well-documented analysis of the problems involved in bringing into being a politically stable and economically viable state within the central African region.

The book gives a succinct account of the whole movement towards federation. From the outset the intention of the British Government was clear that 'no conditions, disabilities or restrictions, which do not equally apply to persons of European descent, shall be imposed upon natives (save in respect of the supply of arms, ammunition and liquor)' (p. 26). Yet, in several chapters, Professor Franck shows how, as the territories have moved at different rates towards self-government (which has virtually meant the government by small white minorities), the rights and interests of the black African have been subordinated to those of the whites. He shows how the black African suffers under severe disabilities in respect of land tenure, freedom of movement, education and the social services, and even in the administration of the law 'Africans are punished more severely than Europeans for comparable offences' (p. 101).

In Chapter 11, on the Social Dynamics of Partnership, the Church as a factor in interracialism is discussed. The leadership of the Christian Churches is shown to be unequivocal in rejecting once for all the doctrine of segregation and in demanding 'equality of human rights for all citizens' (p. 218). Yet 'one of the central issues of our time is whether Christianity can lose its stigma as a "white man's religion" ' (p. 220). The question is raised as to whether it would not be better 'to lose a handful of whites in Africa to the Christian faith than lose the faith itself to the heresy of race supremacy' (p. 220).

Professor Franck is convinced that the only possible solution which can preserve the Federation is for Britain to retain its authority in N. Rhodesia and Nyasaland until the people of these territories have been brought to the point where they are willing and able to participate and contribute as equals in the political and economic affairs of the Federation. The granting of Dominion status should be resisted so long as it involves the complete political independence of a dominant white minority. Such a transfer of political power would be madness at the present juncture, for it would force 'five million black Africans to choose between revolution and indefinite subjection to the white minority' (p. 316). The leaders of the black Africans are justifiably suspicious of Federation because they know that 'native rights in the three territories of the Federation vary inversely with the degree of self-government granted to the territory' (p. 28), whilst to the south they see a country in which Dominion status has made possible the acceptance by a government of Apartheid and extreme racialism.

This book provides a competent and comprehensive survey of the origin and development of the Federation, and indicates the way to political, social and economic advance.

D. Howard Smith

THE DEVIL OR EVIL?*

The appearance of this book whose importance is quite out of proportion to its size, could not have been better timed intentionally, coinciding as it does with the controversy about the retention or omission from the Catechism (and therefore also presumably from the Confirmation and Baptism services) of mention of the Devil. While inevitably relying a good deal on the pioneer work of Dr.

**The Significance of Satan*, by Trevor Ling. S.P.C.K. Biblical Monograph Series. pp. 114. 12/6.

Edward Langton in the field of biblical angelology and demonology, this book isolates from the wider considerations of the subject and deals solely with Satan as referred to in the New Testament. Mr. Ling evidently starts with a preconception of extreme hostility to the idea of devils in the plural, i.e. of individual evil obsessing entities, and seeks to show that the whole New Testament emphasis both in the gospels and epistles is away from individual spirits to one basic controlling force—Satan. I do not think this view is altogether right, but it certainly does not vitiate the main conclusions of the book which are of extreme importance for sociological thinkers, as well as for our liturgical experts. Mr. Ling shows most convincingly that the sphere attributed to Satan is almost coterminous with those other mysterious words 'The World', which bewildered confirmation and other candidates are required to renounce. He demonstrates that the realm of Satan is the socio-political organisation of the secular world which is outside the realm of Christ in the redeemed community of the Church. In his final and most important chapters in which he interprets the mythology of Satan in modern terms Mr. Ling writes concerning Satan and the angelic powers (of evil) which are under his sway 'The most that can with safety be said is that St. Paul acknowledges the reality of such powers experienced by man in the collective forces which are present in the life of human society; and that he affirms that through Christ and in Christ these forces are robbed of their compulsive power'. Avoiding any entanglement with the possibility of a dualism, Mr. Ling clearly sees Satan as a part of God's fallen creation, and as personifying the forces operating in the social or collective life of man as fallen. And he sees social life, apart from Christ as a malign power trying to dominate man and thus destroy personality or even deny him any right to be a person.

The relevance of this to man in modern totalitarian states is obvious, and this book is a valuable contribution to interpreting the mythology of the New Testament in modern terms.

Within the self-imposed limits of this brilliant piece of work, we may regret that Mr. Ling never poses the really important question as to whether a Satan or personal source of evil exists, or what is the origin of the evil influence in society which however can only operate where it finds an open door in the already existing evil will of man; but its great value lies in the clear exposition of what the concept stands for in the thought and usage of the biblical writers. Mr. Ling's conclusions obviously shed much light on that other obscure word the 'World' which is so unintelligible to confirmation candidates. Anglicans as a whole have not yet come to that head-on collision with existing society which the early Christians felt forced to have with the Roman power, and the dichotomy between the 'church' and the 'world' which is indicated in the baptismal formula is somewhat unreal to us. One wonders whether it might not be possible to find a formula which was more relevant and intelligible, such for instance as that put forward by the late Canon T. P. Stevens in his revision of the Baptism service, whose promises involve the renunciation of 'All evil, worldliness and intemperance in thought word and deed', which seems a more contemporary rendering of 'the world the flesh and the devil'. Mr. Ling has certainly rendered good service in drawing our attention to the sociological content of the concept of Satan, but his conclusions are hardly likely to prove acceptable to such evangelical revivalists, as press for the reintroduction of the devil, and who mostly fail to see that whether Uncle Screwtape operates solely on his own, or with the co-operation of his well-trained little nephews, it is largely through pressures in society that he achieves his best results, upon man who, as Dr. Robinson recently wrote 'is 99% conditioned by his social environment'.

JOHN PEARCE-HIGGINS

WILLIAM TEMPLE—CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHER*

That Temple was the outstanding leader of the Anglican communion in our time can hardly be doubted, and many would agree that he was the greatest figure in British Church life. But he was not only a leader of men: he was a philosopher and a theologian; and his contribution to philosophical theology has never been examined in sufficient detail. The only studies that have been published are articles or contributions to symposia. Therefore the appearance of a full examination of Temple's Philosophy of Religion is a welcome attempt to meet this need. The author, Mr. Owen C. Thomas, has clearly made himself familiar with the whole of Temple's work, and where there are difficulties he expounds Temple's meaning helpfully and with manifest authority. However, this obvious familiarity with Temple's work does not yield the fullness or depth of interpretation one would have liked. In the introductory chapter on the background to Temple's work, for instance, we are given an all too sketchy account both of Temple's own developments and of the background of philosophical and theological thought. Here, as elsewhere in the book, the discussion ranges over too wide a field in too small a compass with the result that the description of the historical background becomes almost nothing but a list of names. The references to Coleridge on p. 6 seem to suggest that in him we have the father of the idealist movement in nineteenth-century Britain, and if this is Mr. Thomas's meaning it might be said that he has not appreciated how one-sided a picture Muirhead drew of Coleridge. Be that as it may, the 'introduction and background' are far too slight. In an article in *Theology* in 1939 Temple himself had indicated the change in his metaphysical outlook, and from Collingwood's *Autobiography* and similar sources we can form a pretty clear picture of how the climate of thought changed between 1910 and 1940. The chapters on Epistemology and Value evoke the same dissatisfaction. Could it be that Mr. Thomas finds it hard to say that Temple often succeeded only in giving verbal solutions of his problems?

It is sometimes said that Temple was very close to the scholastic philosophers and that he felt that we need a new *Summa*. In view of this interest of Temple's in Thomism it is rather surprising that Mr. Thomas makes only one reference to St. Thomas and does not mention the Aquinas Lecture which Temple gave in 1943 and which was published in the March number of *Blackfriars* in 1944.

In the final part of the book Temple's contribution to philosophical theology is shown by means of an attempt to evaluate his work and to redefine the philosophy of religion. Some useful points are made about Temple's interpretation of natural theology, and Mr. Thomas is doubtless right when he says that the Gifford Lectures 'are really the articulation of a system of personal convictions and are based on the suppressed premise of the truth of the Christian faith'. However, to my mind, his redefinition of the philosophy of religion is much less helpful. To begin with, the whole discussion is bedevilled by the confusion inherent in Tillich's definition of religion as ultimate concern, which the author accepts (p. 150 f.). He does not seem to appreciate that the plausibility of such a view derives from the ambiguity of the word 'ultimate'. Secondly, I am not clear as to what Mr. Thomas means when he says that Theology and Philosophy are parallel enterprises or how he establishes this point. He seems to suggest (must as Tillich does) that every philosophy involves a theological element and so argues that Temple's distinction between Philosophy and Theology as one of differing attitudes cannot be sustained. Thus he says that 'every philosopher faces the problem of trying to combine the attitudes of assurance and inquiry' (p. 156). However true this is it cannot be denied that Temple was right in stressing that the real difficulty in relating Philosophy and Theology was that of

*Owen C. Thomas, *William Temple's Philosophy of Religion*. S.P.C.K. and Seabury Press, 1961, pp. 177. 22/6.

reconciling two essentially different attitudes. Finally, I am not at all sure that the distinction Mr. Thomas makes between Christian philosophy (i.e. a Christian metaphysic) and Philosophy of Religion (a discussion of 'religious phenomena') is really useful. Nor does it seem to me very helpful to say, as Mr. Thomas does, quoting Tillich, that one is a Christian philosopher when one is a Christian and philosophises. To say the least, this is a trivial remark.

The greater part of this review has been a criticism of certain features of this book, and it is only just that it should end by stressing once again, how valuable an exposition it is. Here for the first time the whole range of Temple's philosophico-theological writing is expounded and a serious attempt made to estimate what his contribution has been. It is not too much to say that anyone who wishes to make a study of Temple will find this an indispensable book.

J. Heywood Thomas

MYSTICISM FROM THE INSIDE

What is it like to be a mystic? Dr. Whiteman tries to show us, by describing and discussing his own experiences, of which he has kept a meticulous diary during the last thirty or so years, containing over 2,500 entries. A selection of these forms the backbone of his book.[1] Some of these are 'affective', such as his vivid awareness of the nature of Divinity as Archetypal Light. Most often they are visual, and in them the subject occupies a spiritual 'form' or body in an 'other world' with whose denizens she converses and whose geography she explores. I say 'she' because Dr. Whiteman's form in such experiences is always feminine and generally pre-adolescent. The mystical state is entered either by awakening one's awareness during a dream, or by becoming dissociated during a relaxed state, or by observing a bright scene in a circular 'opening' in the physical world (the crystal-ball is an example) and going through it. Sometimes a mystic can observe his physical body from the viewpoint of the spiritual form, and occasionally there are more complicated cases of dissociation of personality. The spiritual form may change its appearance during the course of a separation, becoming more or less acceptable to the mystic according to the degree of his absorption or obedience.

Using a broadly Plotinian philosophy, Dr. Whiteman discusses the significance of the revelations granted him, and compares notes with other mystics and mediums such as St. Paul, Henry Suso, St. Teresa of Avila, Mrs. 'Willett', and Eastern non-Christian writers. In order to make sense of the discussion, the reader must master a complicated terminology—e.g. mystical form liberation, full or free separations, *deificatio* in the strict or the loose sense, etc.; and he is bound to ask whether the effort is worth while. For instance, it is known that when all sensory stimuli are withdrawn from a person, strange things begin to happen to his mental processes. These range from processions of imaginary elephants to convictions of inner truth, and there is no way of telling whether the latter are any more objective than the former. Similarly, Aldous Huxley's celebrated attempts to extract material of permanent and universal significance from the stuff of his mescal visions may tell us more about Huxley than about the Ultimate. May not the same be true of Dr. Whiteman? Look, for example, at experience 1224 on pp. 193 f. He revels delightedly in the realisation and freedom of being young and feminine, and sees a baby, fondling whom fills him with an emotion of warm mother-love. The scene changes and the baby has become his adult son, though he has only grown a few years older. The son begins to frighten him by trying to press close, so he turns away; but he is still followed. There comes the realization that the man is a part of himself, and at the humiliating thought 'I am a man after all', the subject collapses in tears.

[1] *The Mystical Life; an Outline of its Nature and Teachings from the Evidence of Direct Experience*, by J. H. M. Whiteman. Faber and Faber. 1961. 30/- net.

An analytical psychologist would want to interpret all this as dream-symbolism. Admittedly Dr. Whiteman is convinced he is not dreaming, being usually able to keep the fantasy elements in check and to be aware of himself whilst in the separated state; but it could be that, unlike the rest of us, who cannot remain dreaming after we have named our own name, he has learnt an abnormal degree of control over a dream state. If so, then the immense amount of intellectual effort which has been expended in showing that there is revelation in his visions may simply be the efforts of rationalization against interpreting their origin as psycho-pathological. We should have to conclude that the whole story, starting with his adolescent discomfort at being in an ill-fitting physical body and developing through the whole range of mystical experience, though of immense interest in understanding the psychology of mysticism and mediumship, can teach us little of the nature of the Life of the World to Come. We need to remember that these experiences are only one kind of mysticism and lack very much from a Christian standpoint. Mysticism is not necessarily Christian nor are mystical states necessarily the highest form of religious experience.

The bittiness of the overall arrangement makes it far from easy to assimilate the book as a whole; and certain sections (e.g. the one on Mrs. 'Willett') requires of the reader a deal of background knowledge before becoming intelligible. It is not always easy to follow up footnotes when (e.g.) '*op. cit.*' on p. 188 refers to a book mentioned only once before, and that sixty pages earlier. 'Psychical' on p. 106 l 21 should be 'physical', and a '§ 18' on p. 120 is hard to fit in; there are also misprints of lesser importance on pp. 80, 106 and 129.

Professor H. H. Price has contributed a cautious and thoughtful Preface.

MICHAEL C. PERRY

SHORT NOTICE

Worship in the World's Religions, by G. Parrinder. Faber & Faber, London. 1961. pp. 239. 21/-.

Dr. Parrinder has chosen an important and an interesting subject. Worship, in it many diversified forms, constitutes, at least on first thoughts, for most people what they mean by religion. On reflection they will readily admit that worship is the expression in act and word of belief; but it is a true instinct that causes them to envisage religion primarily in terms of worship.

To conceive of deity, whether existent in one unique or many forms, logically implies for all men the adoption of some kind of attitude. The religions of mankind have shown how various that attitude can be, ranging from R. Otto's sense of the numinous, with its ambivalence of fascination and terror, to the simple trafficking basis of *do ut des* of some forms of sacrifice. To describe and compare such forms of reaction as they have found expression in the various religions is clearly a most useful undertaking.

Dr. Parrinder has provided a pleasantly written description of the various forms of worship practised in the so-called living religions, including what he terms the 'preliterary religions', notably those of Africa. To make such worship intelligible, Dr. Parrinder has been obliged to sketch in something of the background of each faith concerned. Despite his professed concern 'to show these religions as living organisms', in several instances the historical prolegomena seem, however, to be longer than the account of the particular form of worship with which he is dealing.

As a brief descriptive survey of the subject, the book is to be commended. But its true significance seems to lie in the fact that it emphasises the need of a substantial comparative study of the forms of worship current among the religions of

mankind. And such a study should be more analytic as well as descriptive. For example, in the present work references are made to the use of so-called rosaries in many unrelated religions; but there is no comment on this remarkable fact, nor any attempt to discover whether a common motive inspires so widespread a custom. Similarly, in the account of Mahāyāna Buddhism reference is made to 'Masses for the dead' without any explanation of the comparative factor obviously implied in the use of the expression. It is to be hoped that, since he has thus pioneered this field of study, at least in English, Dr. Parrinder will undertake the greater task that his present book suggests.

S. G. F. Brandon

'We acknowledge gratefully the receipt of our contempories, *The Churchman*, June 1961; *The Modern Free Churchman*, Spring and Summer 1961.

News of the Modern Churchmen's Union

Annual Meeting

Members are reminded that the Annual Meeting will be held at St. Hilda's College, Oxford, on Wednesday 26 July, at 5.30 p.m. Nominations for the Council should be sent to the Secretary beforehand.

Subscriptions

At the last Meeting of the Council it was decided that the subscription for members under 25 years of age and for Assistant Curates should be 15/-. Members who qualify for this reduced subscription are asked to write to the Hon. Secretary.

Local Branches

At the Meeting of the Standing Committee at Ripon Hall in April it was suggested that local Branches should discuss the revision of Prayer Book Services and other questions related to public worship. The London Branch has arranged a Meeting for this purpose early in July.

The Arnside Branch (in the Carlisle Diocese) held a Meeting in April at which Canon G. A. K. Harvey opened a discussion on Religion and Science.

Resignation

The Council has heard with regret of the resignation, through ill health, of Lt. Colonel King who has been a member of the Council for many years.

Conference 1962

Next year's Conference will be at Somerville College, Oxford from 7 to 11 August.